

Applicant : JOLLY Page 10
Serial Number : 10/635,589
Amendment in Response to Office Action of 09/28/2004

REMARKS

The Examiner's Office Action has been reviewed. The Examiner's objection with regard to the drawings is noted. Submitted herewith is a complete set of drawings now properly including reference numerals in accordance with the specification as filed. No new matter is being added herewith.

The Examiner's objection to the specification at Line 16, Page 13 is noted. This objectionable recitation has been changed by amendment herewith wherein the word "intermediate" has been changed to "forward."

The Examiner has objected to Claims 6 and 7 in that MPEP 601.01(m) states "Claims should preferably be arranged in order of scope so that the first claim submitted is the least restrictive." Since there are three independent claims and it is not clear whether the second or third independent claim should be ahead of the first, authorization is given to the Examiner to rearrange the claims appropriately by Examiner's amendment. If this is unacceptable, guidance is requested from the Examiner in the arrangement of the claims. Note is taken that this MPEP recitation is not mandatory.

The Examiner has then objected to Claim 2, last line. This objection is deemed overcome by the amendment submitted herewith

Applicant : JOLLY Page 11
Serial Number : 10/635,589
Amendment in Response to Office Action of 09/28/2004

since the objectionable language "the forward section" has been removed.

The Examiner has objected to Claim 3 because the last line appears incomplete. This ground of objection is deemed overcome since the objectionable language "; and" has been removed from Claim 3 by amendment herein.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 3 and 4 "under 35 U.S.C. 112" because of the improper recitation of "each lower piece" in lines 3 - 6. These objectionable recitations are removed by amendment herein at the places pointed out by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 4 because of the recitation in Line 6 of "the rails". In response to the Examiner's rejection, the word "forward" has been inserted before "rails" to make it clear as to the location about which the movement of the rails occurs.

The Examiner has then rejected Claim 6 "under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fredriksson et al '997" and has rejected Claims 6 and 7 "under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Albert '898." These rejections are traversed. The claims originally presented were intended to cover applicant's embodiment wherein the pivot point for the forward and rearward section was located at a point along the angled

Applicant : JOLLY Page 12
Serial Number : 10/635,589
Amendment in Response to Office Action of 09/28/2004

forward rails. Such a location for a pivot point allows for maximum support with minimum inconvenience during the pivoting action. Note is taken that in none of the prior art structures taken alone or in combination is there a teaching for the pivot point of the rails to be at a midpoint of the intermediate rails. This specific relationship of components of the present system is set forth more clearly in the amended claims submitted herewith.

In summary, it urged that applicant's invention is new, not being disclosed in the prior art. Applicant's invention is useful as a significant step forward in the technology and it is urged that applicant's invention is unobvious over the prior art whether taken alone or in any possible combination.

Reconsideration and a notice of allowance are respectfully requested.